

**Remarks/Arguments**

In the Ex parte Quayle Office Action mailed on 21 April 2005, the Examiner objected to various aspects of the drawings and the specification and objected to the claims under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(a). The Examiner noted that the claims were clear enough to understand the intended scope but felt clarification would be helpful. All claims (1-20) were deemed otherwise allowable.

Applicants have amended the drawings, the specification and various claims largely in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions for clarity and to better protect the invention. In view of the various amendments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all outstanding objections.

***Drawings***

The Examiner noted the error in labeling of element 104 of figure 1 as circuit 1 rather than circuit 2. Revised replacement figure 1 is attached hereto in which element 104 has been properly labeled as "SECOND FUNCTIONAL CIRCUIT".

***Specification***

The Examiner noted certain objections to the specification including the Abstract. Applicants have amended the specification and Abstract in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestions.

***IDS***

The Examiner noted a discrepancy in the PALM system records for this application. PALM records indicate that an IDS has been filed and the Examiner finds no such IDS. Applicants have not filed an IDS in this matter and are aware of no relevant prior art to be submitted to the Examiner.

***Claims***

The Examiner noted a number of typographic and grammatical errors in the specification as well as various improper antecedent bases for various claimed elements. Applicants have amended claims 1-3, 5, 9, 14-17, and 19-20 in response to the Examiner's objections.

The Examiner particularly noted an objection to claim 17 where the last two lines recite: "using the latched present state of the first functional signal within the second circuit board during the exchange of test signals". The Examiner suggests that it is necessary to specify for what purpose the signal is being used. Applicants respectfully submit that such clarification is not required. It is the mere recitation of use, *ANY* use, of the latch functional signal in the second circuit while test signal are exchanged between the first and second circuit boards. The particular use is clearly application dependent for a particular application of two cross-coupled circuits and is not relevant to the scope of the claimed invention. Rather, the scope of the claimed invention is intended to cover the step of using the latched signal for *ANY* purpose in the second circuit while test signals are exchanged.

None of the amendments to the drawings, specification or claims introduces any new matter. Further, the amendments to the claims do not change the scope of the intended claimed invention as originally claimed but rather grammatically clarify the intended meaning admittedly understood by the Examiner.

In view of the various amendments and the above discussion, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all outstanding objections.

***Conclusion***

Applicants have amended independent claims 1-3, 5, 9, 14-17, and 19-20, the specification, and figure 1 in response to the Examiner's objections thereto. The Examiner found all claims otherwise allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all outstanding objections and passage of the application to allowance and issue.

Applicants believe no fees are due in this matter. Should any issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Daniel N. Fishman #35,512  
Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP  
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302  
Boulder, CO 80302  
(303) 786-7687  
(303) 786-7691 (fax)